



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,496	07/31/2001	Dmitry Vladimirovich Zybin	U 013571-6	4792

140 7590 02/13/2002

LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

CANELLA, KAREN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/890,496	Applicant(s) Zybin et al
Examiner Karen Canella	Art Unit 1642



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 months MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3,4,5 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1642

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are pending and examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "long" in claims 1 and 6 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "long" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claims 4 and 9 recite: "claims 1-3" and "claims 6-9", respectively. It is not clear if applicant intends this to mean claims 1, 2 and 3, or claims 1, 2, or 3. For purpose of examination, claims 1-3 and claims 6-9 will be read as claims 1, 2 or 3, and claims 6, 7, 8 or 9.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 1-5, 10 and 11 are drawn to a methods of treatment comprising the

Art Unit: 1642

administration of a polyacrylamide gel followed by the transplantation of a therapeutically effective amount of cells producing a biologically active compound into said gel. Claims 6-9 are drawn to a method of culturing exogenous cells comprising the administration of a polyacrylamide get into a host mammal followed by the injection of the exogenous cells into said mammal. The specification does not describe the type of polyacrylamide gel used for this in vivo application. It is known in the art that polyacrylamide get capsules, synthesized in vitro, must be made with agents that can be dialyzed or washed away before introduction of said capsules in vivo (Shimizu et al, Artificial Organs, 1996, Vol. 20, pp. 1232-1233, especially page 1234, first column, lines 21-27 and Sefton US 4,353,888, column 4, lines 40-57). Although successful matrices suitable for forming three dimensional systems can organize in vivo, one must start with a biocompatible polymer (Vaccanti et al, The Lancet, 1999, Vol. 354, suppl. 1, pp. 32-34). The specification does not disclose how to make a polyacrylamide gel that would persist for a length of time in vivo and not result in a non-specific inflammatory response (Gin et al, Journal of Microencapsulation, 1992, Vol. 9, pp. 489-494). Given the state of the art which teaches against the use of polyacrylamide that has not been completely eliminated of toxic substances, and the lack of teachings in the specification regarding a specific polyacrylamide gel formulation that would function as claimed, one of skill in the art would be subject to undue experimentation without reasonable expectation of success in order to practice the claimed invention.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen Canella whose telephone number is (703) 308-8362. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, can be reached on (703) 308-3995.

Application/Control Number: 09/890,496

Page 4

Art Unit: 1642

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Karen A. Canella, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner, Group 1642

February 10, 2002

A
ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600